

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DOC	2	REV DATE	4 April 80	BY	025614
ORIG COM	11	OPI	11	TYPE	02
ORIG CLASS	S	PAGES	4	REV CLASS	C
JUST	22	NEXT REV	2010	INTL	HR 10-2

21 December 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Inspector General's Survey of OTR

1. After reviewing those portions of the Inspector General's report of the Office of Training pertaining to the Registrar Staff, we were pleased to note the relatively few criticisms of Registrar Staff operations. We do feel, however, that much substance of note was omitted and, in certain instances, errors occur in describing particular activities of the Staff.

2. Following are responses to the recommendations contained in the report:

Recommendation #4: It is recommended that: The Deputy Director for Support instruct the Director of Training to consider the appointment of an instructional coordinator in OTR.

Response: This is a weasel-worded recommendation which I believe is meaningless. If the IG believed strongly in this recommendation he would have used the terminology: "direct DTR to appoint" rather than "instruct DTR to consider the appointment." From the comments in paragraphs 25-28, one gathers that there is a wide-spread feeling among instructors that there is a need for a forum of a sort where ideas on training can be discussed. The OTR Senior Staff is presently doing this in its regular meetings when School and Staff objectives are discussed. Some such weekly sessions for all instructors might prove valuable, particularly if the session were chaired by the DTR or DDTR, and would permit the discussion of mutual training problems. If such sessions were held, much of the stated need for a coordinator of instruction would be negated.

Recommendation #5: It is recommended that: The Deputy Director for Support, in coordination with the Deputy Directors for Intelligence, Plans, and Science and Technology, propose to the Executive

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Director-Comptroller that the Training Selection Board be redesignated as the Agency Training Committee and that its responsibilities be broadened as necessary to enable it to function in that capacity.

Response: I find that the interplay of "course" objectives and "training" objectives in the discussion leading up to this recommendation makes interpretation of the recommendation difficult. Course objectives are the responsibility of OTR, training objectives the responsibility of the user of training. I believe each Directorate should have a mechanism for stating what they expect to achieve through training. OTR is well aware of its responsibilities for realistic and well-developed "course" objectives, and is taking steps to revise these. Even if relieved of its responsibilities for reviewing nominations for the Midcareer Executive Development Course, the remaining functions of the Training Selection Board constitute a considerable drain on the time and energies of its very senior members. I believe that a working group or committee, possibly of Senior Training Officers, monitored by TSB, thus making use of the TSB's prestige, could be valuable in ensuring appropriate "training" objectives.

Recommendation #7: The Director of Training:
a) Discontinue the review of nominees for the Midcareer Executive Development Course by the Training Selection Board. b) In proposing revisions of Agency regulations on training as recommended in Recommendation No. 6, delete from the regulations the responsibility of the Chairman, Training Selection Board, for approving nominees for the Midcareer Executive Development Course.

Response: a) Concur for the reasons mentioned in paragraph 5, assuming that adequate and thorough screening of nominees is provided within Career Services and at the Deputy Director level. b) Concur. The IG Report made no mention of a far more unrealistic and unfulfilled requirement placed on the DTR with respect to the Midcareer Training Program.

██████████ makes DTR responsible for serving as a consultant on five-year training plans for all midcareerists who enter the Midcareer Training Program. We believe this requirement should also be rescinded.

25X1A

SECRET

SECRET

Recommendation #8: The Director of Training establish appropriate criteria for determining the types of training that shall be entered on each employee's training record.

Response: Training information entered in the memory system of the Computers becomes the Agency Training File. The print out of selected information from the "File" is the Agency Training Record. In discussing this recommendation, it is necessary to differentiate between the two. [REDACTED] although specifically making reference to the Agency Training Record actually sets standards of input; "to show participation in and satisfactory completion of all Agency-sponsored training except on-the-job training approved by the DTR." The regulation should be revised to reflect that it is input that is being considered here.

25X1A

If it is only this to which Recommendation No. 8 refers, then we concur that there is too much being entered in the "File", e.g., external programs of less than one full day. The purpose for maintaining and producing the ATR relates directly to the usefulness of the information to managers and supervisors concerned with the professional development of their employees. Presently, the Registrar is testing the usefulness of the ATR. A first step in this direction was the printing of the most recent ATR to reflect only the last seven years of training. (This includes some less-than-one-day programs). Training Officers have been queried concerning the usefulness of the modified document. The Registrar is prepared to take a second step by not retrieving from the "File," participation in courses required by regulation for clerical employees at the time of their entering on duty with the Agency. This includes Clerical Induction and Clerical Orientation.

Because we must consider especially both input and retrieval, separate criteria, should be established for both the Agency Training File and the Agency Training Record. We recommend 1) discontinuing the input of information on participation in programs of less than one full work day. 2) discontinuing input of information on Clerical Induction and Clerical Orientation. 3) in contrast, include the Agency-developed, two-week Specialized Active Duty Training for Agency Reservists. Here, then, is the beginnings of establishing new criteria for input and retrieval. It may well be that additional criteria will emerge from the recommendations of the present Information Systems Study Group of the Support Services Staff/DDS.

Recommendation #19 (page 55): "Transfer from the Language Training School to the Registrar Staff those administrative and reporting functions that the Registrar Staff now performs for other OTR schools."

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Response: Concur - A series of meetings of representatives of the Registrar Staff and the Language School has produced a set of procedures to effect transfer of administrative functions as recommended. Under this plan, certain elements of reporting may have to reside in the Language School until full implementation of procedures is achieved.

3. The following appear as errors of interpretation by the Inspection Team:

a. Paragraph 3 - Page 23: It should be noted that the Training Selection Board is a function of the Office of the Director of Training who chairs this Board, and not a function of the Registrar Staff; the Registrar Staff provides Executive Secretariat services for the Board.

b. Paragraph 7 - Page 25: Although it is likely that combining the four separate courses into a single course might reduce the workload, such a system could very well generate new problems not presently discernible. The fact that these four separate courses cut across three separate schools suggests the possibility that another kind of paper workload in our support of individual instructors could evolve.

c. Paragraph 11 - Page 27: The figure of \$700,000 per year being spent on external training is an estimate only.

25X1A9a


Registrar
Office of Training

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~